

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-2 and 5-20 remain in this application. Claims 3-4 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 2, 9 and 15 have been amended to more clearly and particularly point out the invention.

The Examiner objected to Claim 2 because it contained duplicate materials. Accordingly, the claim was amended to eliminate the legume and nut materials.

Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gabby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,328,217). In order to more clearly claim the invention, claim 9 has been amended to state, inter alia, “grinding burr soiled by oil and residue” and “the coarse materials differ from the material that caused the soiling of the burr.” Unlike Applicant, Gabby does not teach, suggest or imply that the food safe materials are composed of material that are different from the material that was used in the grinder that originally soiled the grinding burrs. By way of example only, the grinding machine may be used to grind coffee beans, but the food safe materials may be one or more of several different types of coarse materials, which do not include coffee beans. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to claims 9-14 are obviated.

Claims 15-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kramer (U.S. Patent No. 5,462,427). To more clearly claim the invention, Claim 15 has been amended to include, inter alia, “burrs soiled by oils and residue” and “food safe materials for placing into the mold portions, wherein the food safe materials differ from the material that caused the soiling of the burrs to enable the food safe materials to remove the oils and residue.” Such structure is not found in Kramer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to claims 15-17 and 20 are obviated.

Claims 1 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tea and Coffee Trade Journal in view of Ford et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,865,383). In particular, the Examiner states that Levin teaches that one can clean their coffee grinder after grinding strong flavored coffees by grinding non-descript regular coffee. However, even after the so-called “cleaning” of the grinding machine according to Levin, coffee oils and residue are not removed. The soiled burrs retain their oily—possibly rancid-- residue, whether it be from the original grindings, the non-descript coffee grindings or a combination of both. It is physically impossible for coffee beans (that all inherently have oils) to remove oil and residue from a grinder blade. As such, any subsequent grindings will be tainted by the oily flavors and residue of any prior grindings—even so-called “cleaning” cycle coffee beans. This cross contamination is easily detected through taste by coffee drinkers. Accordingly, in order to more clearly

point out the invention, claim 1 has been amended to include, "burrs soiled with oils and grinding residue" and "apportioning a predetermined amount of a cleaning material, wherein the cleaning material differs from the material that caused the soiling of the burrs and wherein the amount of cleaning material apportioned is sufficient to clean the soiled burr by removing the oils and residue without impacting the flavor of any material subsequently being inserted into the grinding machine." Therefore, it should now be clear that Levin actually teaches away from Applicant's invention. As such, the rejection of claims 1-2 and 5-8 should now be obviated.

Claims 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takada et al (U.S. PGPub 2002/0183261) in view of Hollander (U.S. PGPub 2005/0026798). However, in light of the claim amendments above, the rejections should be obviated.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabby. In light of the claim amendments above, the rejection should be obviated.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer. In light of the claim amendments above, the rejection should be obviated.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

By 

Romi N. Bose
Reg. No. 43,322

1157 Banyon Ct.
Naperville, IL 60540
Tel.: (630) 355-5144